

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

DANIEL NEWMAN,

Petitioner,

v.

Case No. 13-C-103

JAMES SCHWOCHERT,

Respondent.

---

**ORDER**

---

Petitioner has renewed his request for appointment of counsel. In his motion, he lists several attorneys he has contacted in an effort to obtain counsel on his own. Even so, I am not satisfied that the interests of justice would be served by having the taxpayers fund an attorney in this action. The principal reason is that Petitioner's claims have already been briefed at the state court level and the state courts have addressed them. Although the federal court's role is somewhat different in these circumstances, it is difficult to conclude that Petitioner's action would benefit significantly from further briefing or argument. Federal courts have a great deal of experience in independently addressing § 2254 actions (most of which are *pro se*), and I am satisfied from my review of the record that counsel will not be required.

The motion for reconsideration is **DENIED**.

The motion for an extension of time will be **GRANTED** in part. Petitioner will be granted an additional 60 days in which to respond to the Respondent's brief. His response will be due July 1, 2013.

**SO ORDERED** this 3rd day of May, 2013.

/s William C. Griesbach  
William C. Griesbach, Chief Judge  
United States District Court